DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 997 RC 022 934

AUTHOR	Asada, Hideko; Swank, Eric; Goldey, Gregory T.
TITLE	Appalachian College Students & a Multicultural Curriculum.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	37p.; Paper presented at the Appalachian Studies Association Conference (Abingdon, VA, March 1999).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; *College Students; Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Environment; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; *Racial Attitudes; Rural Schools; Rural Youth; *School Culture; Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Appalachia; Institutional Discrimination; Kentucky (East)

ABSTRACT

A study explored the multicultural predispositions of Appalachian college students. Surveys addressing 23 variables related to demography, ideology, race perceptions, and university were returned by 437 students in 12 majors at Moorehead State University (Kentucky). Results indicate that the students of Eastern Kentucky gave tepid support to multicultural goals. Most agreed that multicultural information should be available at the university and that the college should hire more minority faculty/staff. Substantial segments favored the availability of multicultural classes, but most were reluctant to make these obligatory. Only about one-fourth said they felt personally compelled to learn more about cultural diversity. When every variable was simultaneously addressed, none of the demographic or ideological variables showed any impact. Students who held derogatory notions of minorities and insisted that racism had disappeared were those who generally rebuked a multicultural education. Of all variables, the degree of racial resentment was the best predictor variable. Factors that diminished parochial attitudes included racially heterogeneous friendships, liberal friends, multicultural professors, and multicultural classes. Educators should try to construct formal and informal settings that reinforce pro-multiculturalism sentiments, but in a fashion that does not seem imposed or obligatory. (Contains 64 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Appalachian College Students & a Multicultural Curriculum

Hideko Asada, Eric Swank, and Gregory T. Goldey[1]

Paper originally presented to the Appalachian Studies Association Conference
March 1999

Later Version submitted to Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
May 3, 2001

ED 451 997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ERIC
SWANK
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

[1]Hideko Asada, Intercultural Communication Graduate Program, Aichi Shukutoku University, Aichi, 480-Japan.
Eric Swank, Department of Sociology, Social Work and Criminology, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY.
Gregory T. Goldey, Department of Geography, Government and History, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY.

RC 022934

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appalachian College Students & a Multicultural Curriculum

This study explores the multicultural predispositions of 437 students in a Central Appalachian university. After selecting students from a wide range of majors, the paper shows which sort of multicultural programs garner weaker and stronger support in this undergraduate population. Following this descriptive elaboration, a stepwise regression tests a wide range of competing explanatory prepositions. Some of the explanatory models draw from familiar demographic and university-effect variables. However this paper expands on the education literature by drawing upon some sociological, psychological and political science studies of American reactions to other multicultural programs (i.e., Affirmative Action, school desegregation and welfare reform). By adding the variables on symbolic racism, authoritarianism and beliefs in American meritocracy, the final mix of 23 independent variables produces a somewhat robust model. Moreover, this analysis also identifies which educational practices seem to encourage a greater appreciation of a multicultural learning process. Finally, we address issues of generalizing to a national population by comparing our findings to case studies of multicultural education at other universities.

Appalachian College Students & a Multicultural Curriculum

In the last two decades, the topic of multiculturalism has created many public debates. For example, California's Proposition 227 which seeks to end bilingual education, was passed by the 61% of Californian voters (Facts on File 1998). With a majority backing the bill, this policy reveals how most Californians want immigrants to immediately disregard their native language. Along the same lines, multiculturalism is often attacked by pundits who believe that a culturally diverse curriculum hurts white students and destroys the foundation of a classical Western education (see Bloom 1987; Hirsch 1988; Schlesinger 1992).

The academic literature offers less polemical papers and more essays on multicultural teaching pedagogies. Regrettably, there are only a few systematic studies on what college students think about these multicultural teaching efforts (see Lopez et. al. 1995; Levine and Cureton 1998; Beckham 1999). While most of these studies are descriptive, only a few studies have tried to explain why some students retain certain multicultural predispositions (i.e., Astin 1993; Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Pascarella et. al. 1996). However, most of these explanatory studies are in the early stages of knowledge development. That is, most have limited their populations to a single academic major and have had relatively few predictor variables (i.e., Nel 1993; Pohn 1996; Tettegah 1997; Bronstein and Gibson 1998).

The more extensive studies of multicultural attitudes have focused the "liberalizing effects" of college (Astin 1993; Pascarella et al. 1996). That is, these studies look at how student perceptions are altered by the immediate collegiate contexts. While these inquires present a good start, they fail to take into account the larger social processes that sway American political attitudes. Thus, this study includes many non-collegiate variables since these forces may

mitigate any effects of the campus setting.

In addition to the inclusion of many sorts of independent variables, this paper also has a unique sampling component. Earlier studies on student multicultural attitudes have only looked at national or urban samples (i.e., Lopez et. al. 1995; Bronstein and Gibson 1998). As such, these studies gloss over regional differences. However, students from universities in different geographical areas might be more prone to the acceptance or rejection of multiculturalism. For example, students attending deep south colleges such as Ole Miss might have very different attitudes toward multiculturalism than students at City University of New York. Therefore, this paper is unique in that it explores the ideas of students in a state university located in Central Appalachia. By doing so, we can examine about reactions to a multicultural education in a predominantly white, extremely poor and extremely rural setting.

Literature Review

Demographic Factors

Gender has frequently been used in studies that deal with race-targeted policies and cultural diversity (Astin 1993; Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Link and Oldendick1996; Pascarella et al. 1996; Qualls, Cox and Schehr 1992; Sears et al. 1997; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Wood and Chesser 1994). Most of these quantitative studies identify a gender gap and conclude that women show more positive attitudes toward race-targeted policies than men (Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Link and Oldendick 1996; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996; Qualls, Cox and Schehr 1992; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Springer et al. 1996; Stack 1997; Wood and Chesser 1994).

The age of a person has shown mixed results. Some studies show that older respondents

favor multiculturalism more than younger respondents, however, in the same research, age lowers the support for equal opportunity (Link and Oldendick 1996). Likewise, other studies find that older populations hold more negative attitudes toward minority groups (Glover 1991; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). Ironically, other studies find that age has no bearing on the acceptance of multiculturalism or general racial attitudes (Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Sears et al. 1997).

Many scholars have argued that economic statuses can influence racial attitudes. Early proponents of the "hard hat" thesis argue that people from the working class are highly antagonistic to minority groups and are less supportive of race-targeted policies (Lipset 1961). However, the research on the "hard hat" thesis has displayed mixed results. In a few cases, some empirical studies suggest that racial antagonism is higher in the working class. For instance, one study found that manual workers were more pessimistic about racial programs than nonmanual workers (Grabb 1980) and an older study reveals that white males with blue-collar jobs tended to have negative attitudes to Affirmative Action and the civil rights movement (Ransford 1972). Other studies also find that low-income white Americans tend to be stricter in cultural matters (Taylor and Lambert 1996) and lower-class individuals who face economic crisis are more likely to feel threatened by minority groups (Quillian 1996). Conversely, most recent studies have found that racial biases are equally distributed between the different social classes (Ray 1988; Dekker and Ester 1987). For instance, Link and Oldendick (1996) noted that income has no effect on attitudes toward multiculturalism. Similarly, Tuch and Hughes (1996) and Bobo and

Kluegel (1993) discovered no effects of income on attitudes toward race-targeted policies. Finally, some studies conclude that lower incomed peoples are more likely to support equality and social welfare programs (Kinder and Sanders 1996; Schuman et al. 1997). In effect, they argue that those who are economically disadvantaged tend to support policies that have a redistributive nature.

Some works argue that the degree of urbanism carried some explanatory weight. For instance, Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997) found that residents from small towns tended to support English-only legislation more frequently than their metropolitan counterparts. Also, Seltzer and his colleagues (1995) found that suburban residents are more likely to oppose multiculturalism than city dwellers. In contrast, other studies reveal that living in urban or rural settings does not predict attitudes toward race targeted policies (Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Tuch and Hughes 1996).

Finally, the geographical aspect of this sample brings the variable of Appalachian status. Since systematic studies on Appalachian racial attitudes are almost unheard of, one can only guess about the impact of this characteristic. If Appalachians view themselves as a cultural minority, they might think that it is in their best interests to include more information on subordinated groups. Conversely, the perceptions of Appalachians may not lead to a greater appreciation of racial injustices. In fact, Smith and Bylund's (1983) survey found that Appalachians are less likely to believe that racism is a large problem in the United States. Thus, it is possible that Appalachian college students may be like other rural white counterparts who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are less receptive to multicultural education.

Ideological Interpretations and Social Hierarchies

The second cluster of variables deals with general orientations to societal institutions. It is assumed that people who embrace the status quo will see no need to alter the traditional collegiate curriculum. While the issue of legitimacy applies to many institutions, the concepts of "authoritarianism" and "perceived economic meritocracies" have been the best predictors of race program attitudes (Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Alvarez and Brehm 1997).

In testing the "authoritarian argument" some studies conclude that people's attitudes toward obedience and conformity have a bearing on their acceptance of racial policies (Alvarez and Brehm 1997) and an internalization of authoritarianism increases the degree of prejudice (Weigel and Howes 1985). Thus, people with strong authoritarian predispositions might oppose multiculturalism. Similarly, some Americans whole hardly believe that the economic system fairly allocates rewards to talented and hard working individuals. This faith in a meritocracy can result in blaming the poor for their poverty and has a significant impact on opposition to welfare and affirmative action (Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Gilens 1995; Alvarez and Brehm 1997).

Racial Worldviews: Overt Stereotypes, Symbolic Racism, and Racial Resentment

The third set of variables highlights the salience of particular racial attitudes. That is, rather than looking at a respondent's social status or general social values, these variables focus on how people decipher complicated and politically charged world of U.S. race relations.

Throughout US history, racist ideologies have blamed racial inequalities on the shortcomings of Blacks, Asians, Latinos and Native Americans. Although the absolute numbers of "overt bigots" have declined in the last fifty years, many Americans still maintain negative racial stereotypes . It fact, it is estimated that somewhere between 40 and 60% of White Americans believe that racial minorities are lazy, unintelligent, violent, and more likely to be welfare cheats who are hard to get along with (Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Gilens 1995; Link and Oldendick 1996; Sears et al. 1997; Taylor 1998). Predictably, studies have found that whites that cling onto such derogatory characterizations are very likely to oppose the programs that celebrate or assist racial minorities (Alvarez and Brehm 1997; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Gilens 1995; Link and Oldendick 1996; Sigelman and Tuch 1997; Taylor 1998).

From these studies, it is almost self-evident that those who hold overt prejudices will be against multiculturalism. However, as straightforward as this claim seems, the exact role of old-fashioned prejudice remains unclear. The doubts arise from a lack of a simple correlation. The peculiarity lays in the fact that fewer and fewer whites will endorse stereotypical statements while the general opposition to busing and affirmative action has nevertheless remained intact.

To comprehend this anomaly, Sears (1988) has argued that a large percentage of whites have shifted to a new sort of "symbolic" or "contemporary racism." In modifying their racist repertories, Sears contends that symbolic racists do not condone disparaging or derogatory portrayals of minorities. Instead, the symbolic racist implicitly supports contemporary racial inequities by denying the existence of institutional discrimination. That is, these individuals

insist that American racism is a thing of the past and racism has not endured. Subsequently, with a perceived absence of contemporary biases, it seems bizarre to symbolic racists that minorities keep complaining about a non-existent entity. In effect, minority activists are seen as malcontents who keep fabricating racial problems that do not exist. Lastly, if one does not notice any racial injustices, programs such as Affirmative Action or bilingual education are seen as unnecessary wastes of money that address imagined problems (Bobo 1983; Bobo 1988a; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Quillian 1996; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Tuch and Hughes 1996).

Another segment of the population may not be simply annoyed by "misguided" or "pointless" racial policies. Instead, some whites may perceive racial policies as an encroachment on assumed white entitlements. That is, racial programs may be detested since they challenge the very notion of white privilege (i.e., we should only learn about dead white guys and women/minorities did not add much to the "American experience"). In turn, this perception of altering traditional racial arrangements can be seen as an unfair strike against whites. Kinder and Sanders (1997) write that "racial resentment features indignation as a central emotional theme, one provoked by the sense that Black Americans are getting and taking more than their fair share " (293). Thus, multicultural resentments may be voiced by some individuals who see it as another form of a "reverse discrimination" against whites. And while multicultural educations may not illicit as much anger as affirmative action programs, it might be seen as part of an insidious trend that strips whites of their earlier advantages (i.e., cultural icons like Thomas

Jefferson may now be seen as adulterers and whites might have to learn about the lives Chicana maids).

University Contexts and Experiences

The last group of variables relates to the specific college experiences of students. While all of the college students in this paper attend the same institution, their daily experiences and routines might be very different. In turn, this set of variables deals with the different sorts of academic and extracurricular encounters that might affect a student's multicultural attitudes.

There are many reasons to attend college and the students who are intrinsically motivated to learn about the "human condition" tend to promote multiculturalism (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Springer et. al. 1996). Conversely, students who primarily attend college for vocational training or "partying" purposes are less likely to embrace multiculturalism.

Once a person becomes a student, their exposure to different parts of the curriculum can sway their racial attitudes. Some studies argue that the years of education can produce a very small effect on pro-multiculturalism attitudes (Case and Greeley 1990; Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Miville, Molla and Sedlacek 1992; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). However, the years of education might have less of a bearing than the types of classes that students have completed. Many studies argue that those who engage in ethnic or gendered courses are more likely to show favorable attitudes toward racial diversity (Astin 1993; Black, 1994; Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al.1996; Springer et al. 1996; Royse and Riffe, 1999).[3] However, some projects found that the number of multicultural classes had no bearing on the student commitment to social justice (Moran 1989) and students saw a more just society after they completed a class on social oppression (Van Soest 1996). Similarly, the students who gravitate toward certain majors show different levels of multiculturalism acceptance. For example,

students in the humanities and social sciences are more likely to favor multiculturalism than those who major in engineering, business, physical science, nursing, mathematics, and statistics (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Springer et al. 1996). Also, students tend to be more receptive to cultural diversity when they see their professors incorporating some multicultural content into their classroom (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Miville, Molla and Sedlacek 1992).

While classroom interactions can modify student perceptions, the informal side of student friendships might also drive this relationship. Students seem to like multicultural educations more when they think their peers accept inter-racial dating (Hughes-Miller et. al. 1998). Likewise, students who socialize with liberal buddies seem to have a greater acceptance of cultural diversity (Astin, 1993; Milem, 1994). Finally, a person's sense of racial awareness can be indirectly linked to their amount of interracial interactions. This "contact thesis" argues that working or spending free time with people from other races can lessen one's level of prejudice. However, the relationship between interracial contacts and racial ideas may not be that simple. Some studies find that casual contacts with neighbors, workers and schoolmates makes no difference in racial attitudes (Ellison and Powers 1994; Powers and Ellison 1995; Smith 1994). Other studies find that extended contacts with racial out-group members generally lead to more positive inter-group attitudes (Wrights et. al. 1997). Finally, other contact studies add distinct caveats to this relationship. Sigelman and Welch (1993) found that increases in interracial exchanges do not guarantee positive racial attitudes (in fact, some transitory greetings can heighten racial hostilities). Rather, they suggest that hostility for racial groups only decreases after one starts a close interracial friendship.

Finally, the liberalizing effect of the university can be mitigated by other factors. Some studies suggest that students who live on campus are more likely to back multicultural efforts

than their commuting counterparts (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Pascarella et. al. 1996). Similarly, students who work full-time have been found to be less favorable to a multicultural education (Astin 1993; Milem 1994). Finally, members of Greek organizations seem to be less open to cultural diversity (Milem 1994; Pascarella et. al. 1996), and have higher levels of negative racial prejudices (Morris 1991; Muir 1991; Wood and Chesser 1994).

By synthesizing an interdisciplinary literature review, this study has identified twenty-three pertinent variables. While our conceptual model will inevitably miss some extraneous variables, we believe that our list of variables is pretty exhaustive. In breaking these variables into separate domains, this study has assembled four distinct models. With these demographic, ideological, race perceptions and university models in place, the rest of the paper will explore our research design and multivariate analyses.

Research Methods

Sampling Procedures

To gather the data, surveys were distributed at Morehead State University. Being a regional university in Eastern Kentucky, most of the students are rural undergraduate whites. Moreover, many of the students are first generation college students who grew up in economically distressed communities. The university's most serviced counties have per capita incomes around $11,000, poverty rates above 35% and only 7% of the adults hold bachelor's degrees (Bureau of Economic Analysis 1994; Rural Development Working Group 1995).

Adding to the homogeneity of the student body is an administration that places a minimal emphasis on creating a racially diverse setting. The university has few minority professors, rarely invites minority speakers, and has an under-financed minority recruitment

program (the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education sanctioned Morehead State for not reaching 5 of its 8 EEO goals in 2000). On top of this, the college has never established any Black, Asian, Chicano, or Women's studies departments and only a small smattering of race, Appalachian, and women studies classes are offered in a few departments.

In establishing our 1998 sample frame, we decided to use official classes. When implementing a stratified sample we intentionally visited a broad spectrum of different academic disciplines. In the end, we went to biology, business, chemistry, education, English, government, marketing, math, nursing, social work, sociology, and Spanish classes. A variety of classes were chosen since previous research suggests that racial attitudes vary by student major (Astin 1993; Milem 1994).

After distributing the surveys, a batch of 437 usable surveys was collected. The ages of the respondents ranged from 17 to 51 years old, with 76.8% of students falling in the traditional bracket of 17 to 22 (Mean = 22.2, SD = 5.9). Similar to the contours of the official student body, the sample had a majority of women (59.2%) and was predominantly white (92%). When exploring the class backgrounds of students, a large percentage came from impoverished backgrounds. About 15 % of the students earned, or came from families with, an income of less than $15,000 a year, and about 6% placed themselves in the incomes between $15,000 and $20,000. However, the respondents also reported a large number of middle and upper-middle-class incomes as slightly more than 30% of them put themselves in the category of $50,000 or more. Since Morehead State is a rural commuter school, it was not surprising that almost 51% of

the students grew up in rural areas, and 27% lived in small towns. Conversely, only 4% said they lived in the center cities and 11% resided in the suburbs.

Measurement and Operationalizations

Like the American Council on Education (1989) we identified three aspects of a multicultural education: 1) accentuating a pluralistic college environment; 2) multicultural curriculum improvements; and 3) recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students (also see Hughes-Miller et. al 1998). With these attributes in mind, we created a six-item multicultural education index. The first two items dealt with enhancing the college context ("There should be special events or workshops to celebrate different cultures," and "This college should have women's studies or Black studies majors"). Please note that the idea of "pluralistic environment" can be interpreted as the rights of *other students* getting a multicultural education. Other items explored a more compulsory multicultural education. Two questions dealt with issues that would affect *all students* since they argued for a campus wide multicultural education ("The perspectives of a wide range of ethnic groups should be included in the curriculum" and "More content on women and minorities should be taught in required courses"). The next question dealt with their personal desire for a multicultural education (" I wish my college had more information on minority issues"). The last question dealt with university hiring practices ("The school staff should reflect ethnic and cultural diversity"). In the end, this multidimensional index hung together and presented a respectable Cronbach's Alpha of .885.

Most of the independent variables were measured with the five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree). For the authoritarianism scale, one item emphasized the importance of children respecting authority figures, while the second question looked at the

perceived benefits of a strong legal system (Cronbach's Alpha of .635). The meritocracy item professed "Anyone who works hard can succeed" (Gilens 1995).

The stereotype index employed four racist meta-narratives (Cronbach's Alpha of .618). Respondents were if asked minorities were "generally lazy," "more intelligent," "like to be supported by welfare" and "are easy to get along with" (Bobo and Hutching 1996; Gilens 1995; Link and Oldendick 1996; Sigelman and Tuch 1997). We measured symbolic racism, by crafting an item on racial denial. The statement read "Minorities frequently see racism were it does not exist." The first question in our racial resentment index said "Blacks unfairly use affirmative action for their own benefit," while the second insisted that the "government gives Blacks more attention then they deserve" (Sears 1988; Kinder and Sanders 1996; Glover 1991; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). The third question bemoaned "minorities are too demanding when they push for equal rights," and the last question stressed that "teachers spend too much time looking at different cultures" (Cronbach's Alpha of .637).

Several of the university variables employed the five-point Lickert scale. The concept of collegiate motivations focused on a social incentive for attending college—"I went to college to party" (Easterlin and Crimmins 1994; Springer et. al. 1996). When addressing the perceived liberalism of others we wrote "Most of my friends are liberal" and "Most of my professors are liberal." The measure for multicultural professors read "Most of my professors use readings or materials on racial and/or gender related issues."

Other independent variables were measured and coded in a dichotomous manner. For the variable multicultural class, a dummy code was applied to the question "At college(s), did you take any minority or gender related courses such as American Minority Relations, Appalachian Studies, Women's Studies?" (1=yes, 0=no). Likewise, major, gender, dorm living,

greek membership, and off-campus work were coded in a similar fashion (i.e., 1=female, 0=male or 1=greek, 0= non-greek). Finally, the matter of Appalachian status was identified by a person's long-term county of residence (the yes for an Appalachian counties was derived via Raitz and Ulack's 1987 Appalachian classification schemata).

Other items had more idiosyncratic scales. Our income item asked about recent family income (the scale started at zero, expanded by $5,000 intervals, and ended at $100,000 plus). In looking at the degree of urbanism, respondents were given five responses that ranged from a rural to a large metropolitan center area. When assessing class standing, student rankings were translated into numbers (1=Freshman to 4=Senior). The matter of academic achievement was accessed through the students' self-identified GPA. To measure interracial contacts, we coupled an eight-point frequency scale to the question "At college, how often do you spend free time with members of other races?" (the scale went from everyday to never).

RESULTS

Descriptive Results: Attitudes Towards Multicultural Goals

Although educators and pundits have expressed some strong multicultural opinions, it is clear that most of these students were much less certain. When looking for eager multiculturalists, only one item hit the double digit Strongly Agrees (the presence of a workshop). Conversely, adamant objections were equally scarce since only the issue of multicultural majors netted the double digit Strongly Disagrees.

Rather than seeing many multicultural champions or opponents, most students gave neutral or lukewarm responses (the modal scores were either Agrees or Not Sures). More

precisely, the ambivalent mark of Not Sure consistently netted between 30 to 47% of the students, while moderate approvals fluctuated between 23 and 40% for every statement. Clearly, this meant that most students either faintly condoned a multicultural education or were indifferent to a multicultural experience.

Table 1. Percent Responses to the Multicultural Education index

Item name	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S.D.
Add MC Workshops	12.3%	37.2	30.0	12.3	8.1	3.33	1.09
More MC Staff	9.0	40.6	32.3	12.8	5.3	3.35	0.99
Add MC Majors	9.5	31.6	37.7	11.2	10.0	3.19	1.08
Wider MC Curriculum	7.0	42.5	32.5	12.3	5.8	3.32	0.97
MC Class for all students	7.4	23.0	36.4	24.4	8.8	2.95	1.06
Desire for MC Information	4.4	23.0	47.2	17.9	7.4	2.99	0.94

As modest support and uncertainty generally prevailed, a noticeable segment switched alliances on different sorts of items. The largest instances of mild advocacy occurred in the optional affairs (the workshops, hiring of minority staff, and the general inclusion of multiculturalism into the curriculum). This means, that almost half of the students mildly accepted a multicultural education when it was seen as voluntary and easy to avoid.

However, when a multicultural education was framed as a universal requirement, many of the students were less enthusiastic. When multiculturalism was seen as a part of required classes, the Disagrees shot up to 24% while the Agrees dipped to 23%. Similarly, student negativity rose on the topic of personal desires for a multicultural education (NS =47% and D=17%). Thus, we can conclude that while almost half of the students supported the availability of a multicultural education, almost three-fourths of theses same students believed that a multicultural education was not germane to their studies or lifestyle (indicating a high level of white ethnocentrism). Or in other words, a large camp of students approved of multicultural

experiences as long as they are an elective, but when a multicultural education is pitched as widespread and binding, much of their support turns into ambivalence or full-out opposition (confirming Beckham's 1999 national survey results).

This provisional support of race policies is not new to the race-relations literature. In naming this the "implementation gap," Bobo (1996) and Sears (1988) have found that many whites are open to the abstract principles of racial equality until those principles are converted into actual programs (i.e., affirmative action). Thus, our data mirrors the findings that many whites are cultural pluralists as long this commitment does not impinge on their current lifestyle. However, much of these liberal sentiments disappear when race programs ask for some alterations in their daily routines.

Explanatory statistics: The factors that influence multicultural acceptance

In connecting these multicultural attitudes to our independent variables, the project ran four pairwise multiple regressions (we grouped the variables into the clusters of demographic, ideological, racial perceptions, and the college factors). This procedure was utilized for several reasons. First, we wanted to use a multiple regression to control for the effects of other independent variables. Second, the sequential nature of pairwise techniques can highlight the relative explanatory strength that each set of newly added variables.

Model 1: Demographic factors

Column 1 in Table 2 contains the standardized beta weights for the demographic variables. As a whole, this group was not that powerful since the R-squared suggests that this model explained only 11% of the variance in the multicultural education index. Some of this small impact could be explained by the statistical insignificance of most of the variables.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Multicultural attitudes did not vary by the amount of urbanism nor did the students from Appalachian counties show a distinct outlook (however the negative direction suggests that the Appalachian students were less inclined to a multicultural education). On the other hand, three variables presented a statistically significant impact. By far, the gender of a person presented the biggest contribution. With a moderate association, women had more positive attitudes toward multiculturalism than men. Age presented a significant but weaker effect.

Table 2. Standardized Betas for the Regression on the Multicultural Education Index with the Demographic (Model 1) and Ideological (Model 2) Variables

Independent Variable	Demographics	Demographics And Ideological
Gender	.204(0.489)**	.135(0.509)**
Age	.129(0.050)*	.060(0.050)
Income	-.122(0.087)*	-.100(0.085)*
Urbanism	.072(0.238)	.075(0.237)
Appalachian	-.044(0.546)	-.057(0.541)
Authority		-.104(0.176)*
Meritocracy		-.138(0.216)**
R^2	.113	.183

*p<.05 **p<.01
Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Students of older generations were slightly more supportive of multiculturalism. Finally, income showed another weak relationship. In contrast to the theories that locate racism among the poor and working-class, our findings indicate that the more affluent students presented greater opposition to cultural diversity. Thus, the initial regression suggests that it is the older female students from modest economic conditions who are more supportive of the multicultural

imperative while younger more affluent male students are the program's largest critics.

Model 2: Demographic and Ideological Factors

Model two added the ideological factors to the demographic variables. Surprisingly, the ideological variables did not dramatically extend the explanatory power (the R^2 only increased by .069 points to .183). However, the inclusion of these new perceptions altered the relationship of previously significant variables. When controlling for the ideological issues, the effects of age disappeared. Thus, we can conclude that age by itself does not drive the relationship, but rather the beliefs of these older people is what really matters. Conversely, the impact of gender and income shrunk some, but it still remained statistically significant.

With authoritarianism and beliefs in a meritocracy showing some significant results, the combination of these models shows some interesting insights. Students who are female, poorer, less authoritarian, and doubt the reality of an US meritocracy are the sorts of student who tend to support multiculturalism. Conversely, richer male conservatives who embrace the notions of "law and order" and "American economic fairness" are less agreeable to multicultural goals.

Model 3: Demographic, Ideological and Racial Attitudes

The inclusion of the racial attitudinal measures dramatically improved the explanatory power of the independent variables (see table 3). Rather than seeing a small increase, the R^2 grew by 31% to .476. The potency of the racism variables was so impressive that they nullified the effects of most other variables. For example, the significance of gender, income and the ideological variables dissipated after the racial orientations were introduced.

Table 3: Standardized Betas for the Regression on the Multicultural Education Index: All Models

IV	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Gender	.204(0.489)**	.135(0.509)**	.017(0.450)	.000(0.486)
Age	.129(0.050)*	.060(0.050)	.064(0.043)	.007(0.051)
Income	-.122(0.087)*	-.100(0.085)*	-.056(0.073)	-.068(0.074)
Urbanism	.072(0.238)	.075(0.237)	.007(0.224)	.003(0.231)
Appalachian	-.044(0.546)	-.057(0.541)	-.049(0.466)	-.077(0.481)
Authority		-.104(0.176)*	-.063(0.151)	-.060(0.158)
Meritocracy		.138(0.216)**	.064(0.184)	.030(0.191)
Stereotype			.171(0.098)**	.143(0.101)**
Symbolic racism			.125(0.238)**	.117(0.248)*
Resentment			.393(0.094)**	.381(0.097)**
College value				-.019(0.217)
Class stand				-.002(0.237)
Academic achievement				-.026(0.426)
Business Major				.095(0.709)
Social Science Major				.002(0.941)
MC Courses				.200(0.651)**
Professor-liberal				.041(0.276)
Professor-multicultural				.095(0.213)*
Peer-liberal				.107(0.264)*
Free time w/ minority				.109(0.130)*
Dorm				.040(0.497)
Off-campus job				.037(0.019)
Greek				-.030(0.587)
R^2	0.113	0.183	0.476	0.529

*p<.05 **p<.01 Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

All three of the racial interpretations showed unique effects (we ruled out spuriousness by earlier correlation tests). Both the amount of internalized stereotypes and the denial of racism displayed significant results. However, the resentment variable clearly surpassed the strength of all other variables since it matched the moderate level of influence (.393).

In making sense of these findings, some trends become apparent. The demographic and general ideological characteristics of people have little consequences when the perceptions of

race relations are placed in the model. Thus, when addressing the subject of multicultural inclinations the student's ascribed social statuses and general reverence for American institutions do not seem to be that important. Instead, the way in which people perceive the righteousness of the racial order is what matters. Additionally, it is clear that both the "older" and "newer" versions of racist ideas seem to predict the preferences for a multicultural education. That is, if whites think minorities are inferior, that racism does not exist, and that minorities are challenging their place of privileged, then they are generally opposed to any efforts of a multicultural education.

Model 4: Demographic, Ideological, Racial Attitudes, and University factors

The last regression merged the university variables into the formula. As most of these variables left little impressions, the R^2 was increased only by .053 to .529. In fact, with these university variables providing such a small boost, it seems safe to assume that racial predispositions of undergraduate students outweighs most effects of the university's social milieu.

Few of the university variables added much explanatory power. None of the majors showed a greater acceptance of a multicultural education. Furthermore, the reason students came to college, student GPA, student class standing, the place of residence, the responsibility of an off-campus job, and membership in a Greek association did not show any independent effects on student multicultural attitudes.

Four of the university variables netted some significant results. These significant variables all dealt with perceptions of social cues and reference groups. When students intentionally participated in racially integrated social settings, then they are more supportive of a

multicultural education. Similarly, when professors and student friends were seen as proponents of a multicultural education, then the students were more prone to see themselves as multiculturalism advocates. Moreover, students who have completed multicultural classes were more appreciative of a multicultural experience. Thus, the importance of creating pro-multiculturalism social environment must be stressed. That is, if student and professional sub-cultures both affirm the value of a multicultural education, then students are more likely to embrace the multiculturalism notion.

When making some final assessments of the total model, some insights emerge. First, when simultaneously addressing every variable, none of the demographic or ideological variables show any impact. So, much of the essentialist assumptions about the gender gap, working-class racism, the liberalism of urbanites, and the distinct racial views of Appalachians went unsubstantiated in the total model. Second, while the extent in which a person accepts economic and other hierarchies seems to explain general attitudes to Affirmative Action, it does not predict the student's multicultural attitudes in this sample. Third, these findings highlight the importance of racially politicized interpretations. When students envision their college friends as liberals and professors as multicultural, then they are more likely to be multicultural supporters. Similarity, the act of taking a multicultural class seems to stimulate some greater multicultural affinities. Moreover, students who hold derogatory notions of minorities and insist that racism has disappeared are those who generally rebuke a multicultural education. But of all of these variables, it is clear that the degree of racial resentment is the best predictor variable. Thus, we can reasonably conclude that people who feel cheated by present racial relation will be the first to join an anti-multiculturalism backlash.

Discussion

Before addressing the ramifications of this research, we should reiterate some of our methodological limitations. The use of cross-sectional data is problematic since it cannot present the temporal order of events. For example, without longitudinal cohort data it is impossible to determine if favorable multicultural perceptions preceded or followed the completion of a multicultural class. Furthermore, the use of surveys carries inherent shortcomings. There is always an issue of social desirability and measures are never perfect. For example, to save space some of our measures used the general concept of "minority." However, the use of such a broad term can be misleading since it might gloss over issues of attitudinal variance toward different sorts of minorities. For example, a person might hate Mexicans, love Filipinos, despise gays, and respect Jews. Furthermore, some readers may not be totally pleased with our operationalization of multiculturalism. Empowerment scholars such as Banks (1988) might complain that the items simply asked students about knowledge acquisition and did not address the issue of using this new knowledge for social transformation (Banks calls this the additive versus social reconstruction notions of multiculturalism). Finally, the attitudes of these Appalachian students may not reflect the attitudes of all White Americans. In fact, two case studies suggest some variance in the multicultural perspectives between Morehead State, Florida State and University of Michigan students (Lopez et. al, 1995; Bronstein and Gibson, 1998). Conversely, these generalizibility concerns may be overstated since studies of other commuter colleges have discovered distributions that are similar to ours (Pohan, 1996; Smith, Roberts, and Smith, 1997; Tettegah, 1997; Levine and Curton, 1998).

Even with these methodological constraints, these results can be important to educational researchers and planers. To the possible dismay of conservative commentators, the

students of Eastern Kentucky demonstrated some tepid support of multicultural goals. That is, most agreed that multicultural information should be available at the university and the college should hire more minority faculty/staff. However, this support seems to be conditional to many students. Substantial segments favored the availability of multicultural classes but most were reluctant to make these classes a requirement to graduate (for similar results see Beckham 1999). Furthermore, only about one-fourth of the students said they felt personally compelled to learn more about cultural diversity. Thus, we might conclude that a large number of these students believe a multicultural education is all right, but they are not excited about taking such classes.

The explanatory findings added more insights to this topic. This paper accentuates the importance of certain racial attributions. When students internalize negative racial stereotypes they are more likely to reject a multicultural education. Moreover, students who recoil from a multicultural education are the same students who ignore or dismiss any indications of present-day racism. Finally, students seem to abhor a multicultural education when they exhibit a tendency to scape-goating. That is, multicultural discomfort appears when whites think they suffer from a more inclusionary education. Thus, the white students who maintain that - "minorities are inferior," "no racism occurs" and "reverse discrimination is rampant" are typically those who disavow the virtues of a multicultural education.

However, this paper does not show that these values are the only factors that shape a multicultural outlook. The data indicates that multicultural attitudes may not be static, and that certain university factors did and did not diminish parochial attitudes. The findings suggests that most of the demographic and university variables showed no statistical impact. For example, a student's gender, geographical background, work status, major or Greek membership seemed irrelevant. Conversely, multicultural classes and multicultural readings seem to enhance an

interest in multicultural learning. In turn, this indicates that university programs and individual professors should continue their efforts to incorporate more multicultural material into the formal curriculum. Moreover, this study underscores the relevance of college peer groups. Not surprisingly, students who choose liberal friends also endorse a multicultural education. Similarly, students seem to appreciate a multicultural education when they have racially heterogeneous friendships. Subsequently, educators might try to facilitate such friendships. To do so, programs must initially create an environment that welcomes minority students (this may be a rare event in and of itself). In turn, universities should arrange events and settings that provide some opportunities of interracial exchanges (i.e., music clubs, racially integrated dorms, international student placements). On the other hand, the creation of such events should not place minority students in uncomfortable scenarios. In effect, universities must resist any procedures that place minority students in the tiring position of always explaining racism to their white counterparts.

In the end, this study substantiates the multicultural maxim that educators should try to construct formal and informal settings that reinforce pro-multiculturalism sentiments. However, there is an important caveat. If a professor wishes to enlist multicultural sympathies from all white students, instructors must prudently invent a multicultural experience that does not seem to be imposed or obligatory. Otherwise a multicultural education can trigger a backlash of white resentment (see Van Soest, 1996). A backlash that is predicated on the precept of white's learning about "brown peoples" when the material is framed in their own terms and timeline.

As researchers, we hope future studies build on our theoretical groundwork. We would like to see if our findings would be replicated in a national sample of college students. It seems wise to speculate as to whether the inclusion of racial attitudes will always drown out the effects

of gender, income, age or the university variables (perhaps other college settings would give majors or Greek status a stronger effect). As teachers, we see that this study reconfirms the notion that racial resentments and stereotypes are issues to that must be tackled by progressive teachers. Furthermore, we can see that a multicultural education is not simply a futile exercise. Most students seem to be somewhat receptive to the multicultural imperative and multicultural interventions can augment positive racial attitudes.

NOTES

1. Since some parts of the discussion of symbolic racism can be blended into other theoretical models, thus, this paper will focus on the most distinctive argument of symbolic racism. In making such a choice, this paper will emphasize that symbolic racists deny the continuation of racism as they assume that society treats all races equally. Or in other words, they consider that racial minorities foolish since they are fighting against something that does not exist. One might argue that I ignore the traditional values as a part of element shaping symbolic racism. Sears define symbolic racism is blending of anti-affect and traditional values. However, in this paper, the violation of values such as individualism is not considered to analyze. Because as Bobo argues, American values are always used to rationalize racism or prejudice, therefore, it is not a new concept nor particular to only symbolic racism. Therefore, the consideration of traditional values in the argument of symbolic racism is not taken into account.

2. It is found that some parts of the definition described by Kinder and Sanders (1997) sounds similar to that of group conflict theory. First of all, Kinder and Sanders discuss that racial resentment is different from traditional biological racism. That is also discussed by group conflict. Therefore, the rejecting biological racism applies to the both theories. Second, racial resentment discusses "indignation" that is produced by the "sense" that blacks are "getting and taking more than their fair share." This is almost the same discussion that group conflict theory makes by changing the word from "indignation" to "fear" or "threat." Therefore, both racial resentment and group conflict deal with the rejection of biological racism and also feeling of hostility. Racial resentment does not necessary originate from the combination of anti-affect and violation of values. That is, people can be racially resentful toward racial minority groups without recognizing violation of values or anti-affect. Simply people can be resentful against minority groups when they face the scarcity over resources with minority groups. Therefore, racial resentment seems not be able to stand by itself independently. Since there is some elements also discussed by group conflict theorists, this paper decides to discuss racial resentment with group conflict.

3. In this discussion, there can be a problem of time ordering in this relationship. Students who take multiculturalism classes might have already embraced multiculturalism, so taking minority classes it self might have little effect in itself.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, Michael and John Brehm. (1997). Are Americans ambivalent towards racial policies? *American Journal of Political Science* 41(2): 345-74.

American Council on Education. (1989). *Minorities on campus*. American Council on Education.

Astin, Alexander W. (1993). *What matters in college? four critical years revisited* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Banks, James A. (1994). *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice*. 3d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Black, Beverly. (1994). Students' attitudes toward women: do social work programs make a difference? *Affilia*, 9:417-35.

Bloom, Allan. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuser.

Bobo, Lawrence. (1988). Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In P. Katz (ed.), *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, pp. 85-114. New York: Plenum.

Bobo, Lawrence and Vincent L. Hutchings. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition. *American Sociological Review* 61: 951-72.

Bobo, Lawrence and James R. Kluegel. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes? *American Sociological Review* 58: 443-64.

Beckham, Edger. (1999). The court of public opinion: The ford foundation campus diversity initiative. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 32, 2, 17-23.

Bronstein, L. and C. Gibson. (1998). Student perceptions of content on oppression: the good and the bad news. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 17, 155-67.

Case, Charles E. and Andrew M. Creeley. (1990). Attitudes toward racial equality. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 16(1): 67-94.

Dekker, Paul and Peter Ester. (1987). Working-class authoritarianism. *European Journal of Political Research* 15 (4): 395-415.

Easterlin, Richard and Eileen Crimmins. (1991). Private materialism, personal fulfillment, family life, and public interest: The nature, effects and causes of recent changes in the values of American youth. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55: 499-533.

Ellison, Christopher and Daniel Powers. (1994). The contact hypothesis and racial attitudes among black Americans. *Social Science Quarterly* 75(2): 385-400.

Facts on File. (1998). *Facts on File: Weekly World News Digest with Cumulative Index*

58(30000): 373. NY: Facts on File News Services, Primedia Company.

Frendreis, John and Raymond Tatalovich. (1997). Who supports English-only language laws? *Social Science Quarterly* 78(2): 354-68.

Gilens, Martin. (1995). Racial attitudes and opposition to welfare. *Journal of Politics* 57(4): 994-1014.

Grabb, Edward. (1980). Social class, authoritarism and social contact. *Sociology and Social Research* 64 (2): 208-220.

Hirsch, Jr., E.D. (1987). *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston.

Hughes-Miller, Michelle, Rick Anderson, Julie Harms Cannon, Eduardo Perez and Helen Moore. (1998). Campus racial climate policies: The view from the bottom up. *Race, Gender, and Class* 5 (2): 139-157.

Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn M. Sanders. (1996). *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kinder, Donald and David Sears. (1981). Prejudice and politics: symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40(3): 414-31.

Levine, Arthur and Jeanette Cureton. (1998). *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Link, Michael and Robert Oldendick. (1996). Social construction and white attitudes toward equal opportunity and multiculturalism. *Journal of Politics* 58(1): 149-68.

Lipset. Seymour Martin. (1961). Working-class authoritarianism. *British Journal of Sociology* 12 (3): 277-281.

Lopez, G., D. Holliman, and T. Peng. (1995). Beyond zero-sum diversity. *Educational Record*, Spring/Summer, 55-62.

Milem, Jeffry. (1994). College, students, and racial understanding. *Thought and Action* 9(2): 51-92.

Mivilla, Maria, Bekele Molla and William Sedlacek. (1992). Attitudes of tolerance for diversity among college students. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience* 4:95-110.

Moran, J. (1989). Social work education and student humanistic attitudes. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 25: 13-19.

Morris, JR (1991). Racial attitudes of undergraduates in greek housing. *College Student Journal* 25: 501-505.

Muir, Donald (1991). "White" fraternity and sorority attitudes toward "blacks" on a deep-south campus. *Sociological Spectrum* 11(1): 93-103.

Nell, J. (1993) Preservice teacher's perceptions of the goals of a multicultural education.

Educational Horizons, Spring, 120-30.

Nora, Amaury, and Alberto Cabrera. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education* 67(2): 119-47.

Pascarella, Ernest T., Marcia Edison, Amaury Nora, Linda Serra Hagedorn, and Patric T. Terenzin. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education* 67(2): 174-95.

Pohn, C. (1996). Preservice teachers beliefs about diversity. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 29: 62-67.

Powers, Daniel and Christopher Ellison. (1995). Interracial contact and black racial attitudes. *Social Forces* 74(1): 205-26.

Qualls, Christopher, Mary Cox and Terra Schehr. (1992). Racial attitudes on campus: are there gender differences? *Journal of College Student Development* 33: 524-9.

Quillian, Lincoln. (1996). Group threat and regional change in attitudes towards African-Americans. *American Journal of Sociology* 53: 816-60.

Raitz, Karl and Richard Ulack (1984). *Appalachia: A Regional Geography: Land, People, and Development*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Ransford, H. Edward. (1972). Blue collar anger: reactions to student and black protest. *American Sociological Review* 37(3): 333-46.

Ray, JJ. (1988). Workers are not authoritarian. *Sociology and Social Research* 67 (2): 166-189.

Royse, D. and H. Riffe. (1999). Assessing student values in and era of change. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work* 4: 71-84.

Rural Development Working Group. (1995). Socio-Economic Atlas of Kentucky. Edited by Scott A. Samson. College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky.

Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. (1992). *The Disuniting of America*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo and Maria Krysan. (1997). *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sears, David O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor (eds.), in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, pp. 53-84 New York: Plenum.

Sears, David O., Colette van Laar, Mary Carrillo and Rick Kosterman. (1997). Is it really racism?: The origins of white americans' opposition to race-targeted policies. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(1): 16-53.

Seltzer, Richard, Michael Frazier and Irelene Ricks. (1995). Multiculturalism, race, and

education. *Journal of Negro Education* 64 (2):124-40.

Sidanius, Jim, Erik Devereux and Felicia Pratto. (1991). A Comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 12(3): 377-95.

Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch. (1993). The contact hypothesis revisited: black-white interaction and positive racial attitudes. *Social Forces* 71(3): 781-95.

Smith, Christopher B. (1994). Back and to the future: The intergroup contact hypothesis revisited. *Sociological Inquiry* 64(4): 438-55.

Smith, Kevin and Bob Bylund. (1983). Cognitive maps of class, racial and Appalachian inequalities among rural Appalachians. *Rural Sociology* 48 (2) 255-270.

Smith, Tim, Richard Roberts and Cindy Smith. (1997). Expressions of prejudice among college Students over three assessments. *College Student Journal* 31, 235-237.

Springer, Leonard, Betsy Palmer, Patrick T. Terenzin, Ernest T. Pascarella and Amaury Nora. (1996). Attitudes toward campus diversity: participation in a racial or cultural awareness workshop. *The Review of Higher Education* 20(1): 53-68.

Stack, Steven. (1997). Women's opposition to race-targeted interventions. *Sex Roles* 36: 543-550.

Taylor, Marylee (1998). How attitudes vary with the racial composition of local populations. *American Sociological Review* 63: 512-35.

Taylor, Donald and Wallace Lambert. (1996). The meaning of multiculturalism in a culturally diverse urban American area. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 136(6): 727-40.

Tettegah, S. (1997). The racial attitudes of white prospective teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, 65, 151-63.

Tuch, Steven and Michael Hughes. (1996). Whites' racial policy attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly* 77(4): 723-45.

Van Soest, D. (1996). Impact of social work education on student attitudes and behavior concerning oppression. *Journal of Social Work Education* 32, 191-201.

Weigel, Russell and Paul Howes. (1985). Conceptions of racial prejudice: symbolic racism reconsidered. *Journal of Social Issues* 41(3): 117-138.

Wood, Peter B. and Michele Chesser. (1994). Black stereotyping in a university population. *Sociological Focus* 27(1): 17-34.

Wrights, Stephen, Arthur Aron, Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe, and Stacy Ropp. (1997). The extended contact effect: knowledge of cross-group friendship and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73(1): 73-90.

Table 3: Standardized Betas for the Regression on the Multicultural Education Index: All Models

IV	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Gender	.204(0.489)**	.135(0.509)**	.017(0.450)	.000(0.486)
Age	.129(0.050)*	.060(0.050)	.064(0.043)	.007(0.051)
Income	-.122(0.087)*	-.100(0.085)*	-.056(0.073)	-.068(0.074)
Urbanism	.072(0.238)	.075(0.237)	.007(0.224)	.003(0.231)
Appalachian	-.044(0.546)	-.057(0.541)	-.049(0.466)	-.077(0.481)
Authority		-.104(0.176)*	-.063(0.151)	-.060(0.158)
Meritocracy		.138(0.216)**	.064(0.184)	.030(0.191)
Stereotype			.171(0.098)**	.143(0.101)**
Symbolic racism			.125(0.238)**	.117(0.248)*
Resentment			.393(0.094)**	.381(0.097)**
College value				-.019(0.217)
Class stand				-.002(0.237)
Academic achievement				-.026(0.426)
Business Major				.095(0.709)
Social Science Major				.002(0.941)
MC Courses				.200(0.651)**
Professor-liberal				.041(0.276)
Professor-multicultural				.095(0.213)*
Peer-liberal				.107(0.264)*
Free time w/ minority				.109(0.130)*
Dorm				.040(0.497)
Off-campus job				.037(0.019)
Greek				-.030(0.587)
R^2	0.113	0.183	0.476	0.529

*p<.05 **p<.01 Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Table 1. Percent Responses to the Multicultural Education index

Item name	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	S.D.
ADD MC WORKSHOPS	12.3%	37.2	30.0	12.3	8.1	3.33	1.09
MORE MC STAFF	9.0	40.6	32.3	12.8	5.3	3.35	0.99
ADD MC MAJORS	9.5	31.6	37.7	11.2	10.0	3.19	1.08
WIDER MC CURRICULUM	7.0	42.5	32.5	12.3	5.8	3.32	0.97
MC CLASS FOR ALL STUDENTS	7.4	23.0	36.4	24.4	8.8	2.95	1.06
DESIRE FOR MC INFORMATION	4.4	23.0	47.2	17.9	7.4	2.99	0.94

Table 2. Standardized Betas for the Regression on the Multicultural Education Index with the Demographic (Model 1) and Ideological (Model 2) Variables

Independent Variable	Demographics	Demographics And Ideological
Gender	.204(0.489)**	.135(0.509)**
Age	.129(0.050)*	.060(0.050)
Income	-.122(0.087)*	-.100(0.085)*
Urbanism	.072(0.238)	.075(0.237)
Appalachian	-.044(0.546)	-.057(0.541)
Authority		-.104(0.176)*
Meritocracy		-.138(0.216)**
R^2	.113	.183

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.